UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Western District of Washington

Western Dist	net of washington
United States of America v. OMAR ALEJANDRO BELTRAN MENDOZA Defendant)) Case No. MJ23-5443-01)
ORDER OF DETEN	TION PENDING TRIAL
Part I - Eligib	oility for Detention
Upon the	
	motion pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(2), is warranted. This order sets forth the Court's findings of fact
Part II - Findings of Fact and La	w as to Presumptions under § 3142(e)
and the community because the following conditions (1) the defendant is charged with one of the following condition of 18 (a) a crime of violence, a violation of 18 § 2332b(g)(5)(B) for which a maximum (b) an offense for which the maximum serior of the controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. § (21 U.S.C. § 951-971), or Chapter 705 (d) any felony if such person has been controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. § (21 U.S.C. § 951-971), or Chapter 705	ditions will reasonably assure the safety of any other person have been met: ollowing crimes described in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(1): U.S.C. § 1591, or an offense listed in 18 U.S.C. term of imprisonment of 10 years or more is prescribed; or entence is life imprisonment or death; or m of imprisonment of 10 years or more is prescribed in the § 801-904), the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act of Title 46, U.S.C. (46 U.S.C. §§ 70501-70508); or onvicted of two or more offenses described in subparagraphs or more State or local offenses that would have been offenses c) of this paragraph if a circumstance giving rise to Federal m of such offenses; or
(i) a minor victim; (ii) the possession of	a firearm or destructive device (as defined in 18 U.S.C. § 921); a failure to register under 18 U.S.C. § 2250; <i>and</i>
	ed of a Federal offense that is described in 18 U.S.C.
to Federal jurisdiction had existed; and	t would have been such an offense if a circumstance giving rise
	ve for which the defendant has been convicted was e pending trial for a Federal, State, or local offense; <i>and</i>
committee ville describant vius on selection	penano mai for a reactar, state, or focus offense, and

(4) a period of not more than five years has elapsed since the date of conviction, or the release of the defendant from imprisonment, for the offense described in paragraph (2) above, whichever is later.

AO 472 (Rev. 11/16) Order of Detention Pending Trial

B. Rebuttable Presumption Arises Under 18 U.S.C. § 3142(e)(3) (narcotics, firearm, other offenses): There is a
rebuttable presumption that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the appearance of the defendant as required and the safety of the community because there is probable cause to believe that the defendant committed one or more of the following offenses:
(2) an offense under 18 U.S.C. §§ 924(c), 956(a), or 2332b;
(3) an offense listed in 18 U.S.C. § 2332b(g)(5)(B) for which a maximum term of imprisonment of 10 years or more is prescribed;
(4) an offense under Chapter 77 of Title 18, U.S.C. (18 U.S.C. §§ 1581-1597) for which a maximum term of imprisonment of 20 years or more is prescribed; or
(5) an offense involving a minor victim under 18 U.S.C. §§ 1201, 1591, 2241, 2242, 2244(a)(1), 2245, 2251, 2251A, 2252(a)(1), 2252(a)(2), 2252(a)(3), 2252A(a)(1), 2252A(a)(2), 2252A(a)(3), 2252A(a)(4), 2260, 2421, 2422, 2423, or 2425.
☑C. Conclusions Regarding Applicability of Any Presumption Established Above
The defendant has not introduced sufficient evidence to rebut the presumption above, and detention is ordered on that basis. (Part III need not be completed.)
OR
The defendant has presented evidence sufficient to rebut the presumption, but after considering the presumption and the other factors discussed below, detention is warranted.
Part III - Analysis and Statement of the Reasons for Detention
After considering the factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(g) and the information presented at the detention hearing the Court concludes that the defendant must be detained pending trial because the Government has proven:
By clear and convincing evidence that no condition or combination of conditions of release will reasonably assure the safety of any other person and the community.
By a preponderance of evidence that no condition or combination of conditions of release will reasonably assure the defendant's appearance as required.
In addition to any findings made on the record at the hearing, the reasons for detention include the following:
 ☐ Weight of evidence against the defendant is strong ☐ Subject to lengthy period of incarceration if convicted ☑ Prior criminal history
Participation in criminal activity while on probation, parole, or supervision
☐ History of violence or use of weapons
History of alcohol or substance abuse
☐ Lack of stable employment
☐ Lack of stable residence
Lack of financially responsible sureties
☐ Lack of significant community or family ties to this district

AO 4/2 (Rev. 11/10) Order of Detention Fending Than	
☐ Significant family or other ties outside the United States	
☐ Lack of legal status in the United States	
Subject to removal or deportation after serving any period of incarceration	
Prior failure to appear in court as ordered	
Prior attempt(s) to evade law enforcement	
Use of alias(es) or false documents	
Background information unknown or unverified	
Prior violations of probation, parole, or supervised release	
OTHER REASONS OR FURTHER EXPLANATION:	
Even if the defendant had produced enough evidence to overcome the presumption of detention, the Court would order detention. Applying the factors without considering the presumption under 18 U.S.C. Section 3142(g), the Court finds no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the safety of the community or reasonably assure the appearance of the defendant. The Court finds by a preponderance of the evidence the defendant is a risk of failure to appear the Complaint (Dkt 1) shows that Mr. Beltran Mendoza attempted to flee the scene of the arrest; and the pretrial services report shows that he has criminal history showing more than one instance of entering the United States illegally. In addition, the Court finds by clear and convincing evidence that Mr. Beltran Mendoza is a safety risk because the circumstances of the crime show teamwork with other individuals not that he was simply acting by himself and there are allegations in the Complaint that he was involved with organizing sales of large quantities of particularly dangerous controlled substances, methamphetamine, and fentanyl.	
Dout IV Divertions Described Detaution	
Part IV - Directions Regarding Detention	
The defendant is remanded to the custody of the Attorney General or to the Attorney General's designated representative for confinement in a corrections facility separate, to the extent practicable, from persons awaiting or serving sentences or being held in custody pending appeal. The defendant must be afforded a reasonable opportunity for private consultation with defense counsel. On order of a court of the United States or on request of an attorney for the Government, the person in charge of the corrections facility must deliver the defendant to a United States Marshal for the purpose of an appearance in connection with a court proceeding.	

Date:

01/09/2024

United States Magistrate Judge

Theresa L. Frike